

"PERPETUAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF LIBERTY," FOR "POWER IS ALWAYS STEALING FROM THE MANY TO THE FEW."

[NUMBER 43.]

from North Carolina appears to labor, I
beg to ask him what would be the state of

our rights in New Mexico and California, if the laws now in force there were left unchanged? Can he point out any mode by which our rights would be more secure, without repealing the laws now in force?

Mr. BADGER. I think I could point

out a very just and equitable mode which would save the honor of all the parties to this agitating question. We have, however, now to do with the measure before us, which is recommended to us, as I have remarked; because it saves our honor. I say, according to my judgment, it saves no such thing.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask if any other remedy, which has been indicated here, would not be obnoxious to the same objection?

Mr. BADGER. I think I could mention one. I repeat, sir, that, in my opinion, by this measure we surrender the whole and gain nothing in return. If it were to be the means of putting an end to this dan-

persons and disorganizing agitation—if it would bring peace and quiet to the country—I would go home among my constituents, and, appealing to them as citizens of one of the old original thirteen, of whose gallant sons some died upon the battle fields of the Revolution, and others went down to their graves covered with honorable scars, and hundreds and thousands did battle in vindication of their country's cause, I would say

to them—to the people amongst whom I was born, amongst whom I have lived, to whose kindness, promotion, and patronage, I owe every thing of distinction and prosperity that I enjoy, amongst whom I expect to die, amongst whom my children, I trust, will live

I am a gene—I would say to them, I understand this surrender because I know your deep devotion to the institutions handed down by our forefathers; because I know your resolute opposition to every thing by which the union of the States may be weakened or weakened; because I felt assured that you would justify me in giving up whatever of interest or feeling you might have on this question, in order to preserve the

But have we the least reason to believe that peace and harmony will be the result of the passage of this bill? Sir, we have none. On the contrary, we have convincing evidence that its passage would be the signal for a new and bitter agitation. Sir, I could not stand up before my constituents, patriotic as they were, willing as they are to

make large concessions, and tell them that I had voted for a bill by which, in effect, they were excluded from the new territories, by which all their interests were surrendered, and nothing gained in return. Is it not plain that this is so? Do gentlemen from the North accept the surrender in good part? On the contrary, do they not rebel at with scorn? And do we not already hear from afar a storm of denunciation?

Mr. President, I do not regard the surrender of which I have spoken as a matter of such entire insignificance as some gentlemen appear to consider it. We have had numerous attempts to go to California and New Mexico; but, according to the best information I have been able to obtain, there are portions of the former suited to the cultivation of cotton and sugar. If so, it is my deliberate conviction that slaveholders should

be allowed to settle there. I do not deny, I have expressly admitted, that Congress has the power to prohibit slavery there.—Believing this to be so, I have made no attempt to support the cause of the South by denial or evasion. But I say to our northern friends, that if the country is adapted to the cultivation of cotton and sugar, slaveholders should be allowed to people it, and to leave to church for them that advantage.

I have been extremely pained at the course of observation which has been indulged in by several gentlemen in speaking upon this bill; and having expressed, fully and frankly, my own opinion upon the question of power, I will add some remarks addressed to what I consider the expediency and propriety of surrendering into these

and property or anything and these territories the slaves of the South. I claim an exemption from those bases which belong to my particular position, but I will say this, that if I know myself, (a very difficult matter, I am aware,) what I am about to say is the honest conviction of my understanding. What is the true position, then, of this question, upon which our friends from the North have saken in such indignation, page 2. In the first place such

ment terms: in the first place, it is not proposed to introduce an additional slave upon the soil of America. We ask no such thing. On the contrary, I venture to say that no man can be found in the northern section of the Union, though he be the most ultra of all abolitionists, who is more thoroughly, absolutely, and totally opposed to the introduction of African slaves in the country, than are the entire population of the United States. Not a single man

to South. Northern gentlemen take up his subject upon some theory, in itself not sound, and not very soundly reasoned from, as it appears to me; they tell us that slavery is wrong, is an evil, and, therefore, they are resolved that those who are now slaves shall not, under any circumstances, be removed into territory now free; that free oil shall forever remain free. Now, in this, are they dealing with the subject as it really is?

practical men: it is a great question, and is entitled to a fair and practical consideration. We have among us the institution of slavery, for which we are not responsible. It was forced upon our forefathers by covarice and power from abroad. But, however produced, here is the institution, and among us are nearly three millions of slaves. Now, what is to be the consequence of al-

